

KING COUNTY DISTRICT COURT OPERATIONAL AND FACILITY MASTER PLAN –
SCOPE OF WORK – April 28,2004
EXHIBIT A

Project Overview

The consultant will evaluate and recommend methods for providing the delivery of court services and the costs of services for an Operational Master Plan (OMP) and a Facilities Master Plan (FMP) for the King County District Court, focusing on identifying system efficiencies and developing recommendations for service delivery while continuing to meet mandated requirements in a fiscal climate of declining resources (analysis will include the separation of services between those mandated versus non-mandated and analytical forecasting and cost modeling to evaluate alternatives in operations.)

The work will be completed by December 2004.

Scope of Work

A. Operational Master Plan Definition (Reference is King County Code 4.04.020 LL)

The OMP serves as the comprehensive plan that sets forth how the King County District Court is to provide court services now and in the future. The OMP shall include an analysis of:

- Projected workload,
- Resources,
- Performance measures,
- Strengths and weaknesses (not a requirement in code),
- Operating alternatives,
- Estimated costs of alternatives (including life cycle of capital costs),
- Implementation schedules.

The OMP shall also address how the organization would respond in the future to changed conditions.

B. OMP/FMP Objective

In alignment with the District Court Mission and Vision statements, evaluate and recommend methods for providing the delivery of court services (defining what services and level of services) and the costs of services (judicial, staff, and facilities).

Identify system efficiencies and develop recommendations for service delivery while continuing to meet mandated requirements in a fiscal climate of declining resources being cognizant that District Court is part of a larger system of justice.

Analyze services and service delivery in the context of the larger criminal justice system, including identifying mandated versus non-mandated services and the impact to the District Court and larger criminal justice system of providing, not providing, or changing these services.

District Court Services Include (not in priority order and not a complete list):

- General Criminal
- Problem Solving Courts
- Infractions
- Tow/Impound Hearings
- City Contract Cases
- Portability/Superior Court
- Expedited Felonies
- Presiding Judge/Office of the Presiding Judge
- Probation
- Passports
- Inquests
- Jail 1st Appearances
- Name Changes
- Search Warrants
- In Custody Hearings
- Nuisance Hearings
- Forfeiture Hearings

C. Work plan Overview:

- 1) Framework: Create a framework for evaluating and recommending options for providing court services (defining what services and level of services) and the costs of services (judicial, staff, and facilities). This framework must provide for evaluation and recommendation of options for court services that:
 - a) Are in alignment with the District Court Mission and Vision;
 - b) Meet mandated requirements in a fiscal climate of declining resources; and,
 - c) Take into consideration operational and cost impacts on the other components of the King County criminal justice system (King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, Office of Public Defense, King County Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention, Superior Court, and King County Department of Judicial Administration, and King County Sheriff), as District Court is part of a larger system of justice.
- 2) Baseline and Forecast: Prepare a baseline caseload identifying mandated versus non-mandated services and level of service to project workload factors for district court – taking into consideration varying types of cases, and current and alternative filing and processing practices.
 - a) Prepare a baseline profile of current and alternative caseload and how it has changed over last 5 to 10 years.
 - b) Prepare caseload (criminal, infraction, and civil) and workload forecasts for a 10-year horizon for cities, urban unincorporated, rural unincorporated and regional/other caseload, incorporating impact of potential annexations, growth/change in population. (Annexation information and population forecast information to be provided by King County.)
- 3) Options: In alignment with District Court mission and vision (including accessibility to justice), create different options for analysis to include a cost, operating, and facilities model to track and quantify all of the assumption variables, so that the County can identify impacts

of alternative approaches and combination of approaches. The model should include factors such as (not listed in priority order):

- a) Mandated versus non-mandated services
 - b) Cost and operational impacts on other criminal justice system components (King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, Office of Public Defense, King County Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention, Superior Court, and King County Department of Judicial Administration, and King County Sheriff);
 - c) Space needs (additions, improvements, reductions, new space);
 - d) Centralized versus de-centralized court services and location of court services;
 - e) Judicial/Commissioner;
 - f) Clerical, probation, administration and other staff needs;
 - g) Operational efficiencies;
 - h) Cost effectiveness;
 - i) Change in caseload (including annexations);
 - j) Impacts of "best practice" recommendations;
 - k) Forecast for future funding from King County general fund – based on available information from the King County Office of Management and Budget; and,
 - l) Forecast for other sources of funding – including fines, forfeitures, fees, grants, and other district court operating revenues.
- 4) Recommendations: Based on information gathered in steps 1 through 3 – analyze and recommend options including full cost and impacts to the criminal justice system as a whole and further considering the affects on access to the justice system.
 - 5) Implementation: Develop an implementation plan that includes the establishment of performance measures to provide an on-going evaluation.
 - a) Include short term, intermediate term, and long-term implementation plan and goals.
 - b) Identify those that are within the King County span of control to implement versus those that require action by an external agency to implement (e.g. state legislature).

D. In order to help direct the work of the consultant, the following questions are areas that are needed to be addressed during the process. The order in which the following items are presented should not reflect upon their relative importance in this process.

- 1) Include a discussion on the financial and operational impact of recommendations on other stakeholders (Superior Court, Office of Public Defense, King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office, King County Department of Adult and Juvenile Detention, King County Sheriff, contract cities.)
- 2) What are mandated versus non-mandated directed court services? What level of service is required for District Court services (constitutional, statute, state court rule, county policy)? What are the operational and potential capital needs of mandated versus non-mandated services?
- 3) The analysis and recommendations should address current practice and alternatives to current practice to deliver services in alignment with the District Court mission and vision. Recommendations should discuss the impact on service to the public and other stakeholders. Include at a minimum (not listed in priority order):

- a) Location of court operations
 - b) Municipal court contracts (pros/cons/costs/benefits)
 - c) Use of elected judiciary versus court commissioners (pros/cons/costs/benefits)
 - d) Use of Dispute Resolution, Mediation, Traffic Referees, etc. (pros/cons/costs/benefits)
 - e) Hours of court operations (pros/cons/costs/benefits)
 - f) Technology options for service delivery (e-mail, internet, electronic court records, etc.) (pros/cons/costs/benefits) (Note: Countywide system effort with LSJI).
 - g) Options for pro tem coverage for judicial vacation/sick leave backfill (pros/cons/costs/benefits)
 - h) Unified court administrative structure between Superior Court and District Court versus current practice (pros/cons/costs/benefits)
 - i) Best practices from other jurisdictions and alternatives to current practice recognizing the span of judicial control in King County District Court compared with other jurisdictions.
- 4) The analysis and recommendation should address impact on staffing.
- a) How does the estimate for judicial need change under different workload assumptions (e.g. mandated versus non-mandated type of caseload, number of cases, annexations, contracting with municipalities, problem solving courts, probation, etc.)?
 - b) Estimate staff needed for District Court (clerical, probation, administrative and other staff), and how these estimates change under different workload assumptions (e.g. mandated versus non-mandated, type of caseload, number of cases, annexations, contracting with municipalities, problem solving courts, probation, etc.)?
- 5) What is the optimum facility location for court services?
- a) Evaluate the impact on mandated and non-mandated services
 - b) Evaluate the de-centralized court services versus centralized court services.
 - c) Analysis will include space needs for storage, courtroom staff, non-courtroom staff, jury rooms, security, client counters, and parking recognizing that change in space planning is governed through the adoption of the County Space Plan and that there are concurrent efforts to address courthouse space needs through the "Near Term Courthouse Space Planning Team" led by the Department of Facilities Management.
 - d) Evaluate existing technology and future technology needs.
 - e) Identify potential capital improvements and estimated timeline needs.
 - f) Address potential facility sharing arrangements or multi use options (e.g. sharing with cities, other King County agencies, system providers, etc.)